

### **REMARKS**

The claims have not been amended. Claim 2 was previously canceled, and claims 4-6 and 10-22 were previously withdrawn. Accordingly, claims 1, 3, and 7-9 are currently pending in the application, of which claim 1 is an independent claim. Applicant requests reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending rejections for the reasons discussed below.

#### ***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1, 3, and 7-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 10-214614 issued to Inoue ("Inoue"). Claim 1 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Chinese Patent Application Publication No. 2473755 ("CN '755"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

wherein the negative electrode lead comprises a planar portion electrically coupled to the negative electrode plate and a curved portion arranged out of plane from the planar portion, the curved portion having the same width as the planar portion, and the current interrupter is arranged in the curved portion of the negative electrode lead, and

wherein the current interrupter has a cross-sectional area that is smaller than a cross-sectional area of an adjacent portion of the planar portion. (emphasis added)

The examiner concurs that both Inoue and CN '755 fail to disclose at least these features. Specifically, the examiner states that Inoue and CN '755 fail to disclose "the specified curved portion out of plane from a planar section." See Office Action, page 5, 6. To remedy the shortcomings of these references, the examiner then cites to In re Dailey, 149 USPQ 47 in support of the proposition that "changes in shape is [sic] a matter of choice ... absent persuasive evidence that the particular configuration of the claimed electrode lead is significant

or critical.” Office Action, page 5, 6 (emphasis added). The examiner also cites to In re Seid, 73 USPQ 431 in support of the proposition that “aesthetic design changes having no mechanical function cannot be relied upon to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art.” Office Action, page 5, 6 (emphasis added).

However, the shape of a product may be of patentable significance where “it results in a product which is distinct” over the prior art. MPEP, Section 2144.04 (citing to Ex parte Hilton, 148 USPQ 356 (Bd. App. 1965)). Read together, Hilton, Dailey, and Seid stand for the proposition that shape and/or configuration changes that are more than just aesthetic, and provide some mechanical function, may render a claimed invention patentable over prior art.

This proposition, as applied to the present invention recited in claim 1, supports the patentability of claim 1 over the cited references. Specifically, the arrangement of the current interrupter in the curved portion of the negative electrode lead offers mechanical advantages over the cited references.

Based on the disclosure at the time of the invention, a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention (“POSITA”) would understand that the curved portion in the negative electrode lead 36 is provided to create a spring effect and to ensure electrical contact between the negative electrode lead 36 and the negative electrode terminal 63c. See, e.g., Fig. 6B. When the negative electrode lead 36 is placed in compression, the stress is greater in the curved portion than in the planar portion of the negative electrode lead 36 due to a P-delta effect that results from a deflection caused by axial loading. A POSITA would recognize that the increased stress in the curved portion was of concern to Applicant since Applicant disclosed a lower limit on the cross-sectional area of the current interrupter 36a to avoid weakening the “structural strength of the negative electrode lead 36.” See page 10, lines 3-8 of the specification. Further, a POSITA would understand that arrangement of the current interrupter 36a in the high-stress curved portion of the negative electrode lead 36 would best ensure “a

disconnection" at the current interrupter 36a in the event of increased resistance. See page 10, lines 11-14 of the specification. This is supported by Figures 5A to 5F, which all disclose embodiments of a current interrupter 36a arranged in the curved portion of the negative electrode lead 36. For at least these reasons, a POSITA would understand that the claimed arrangement of the current interrupter 36a offers a mechanical advantage other than just aesthetic design changes.

In view of these advantages, neither Dailey nor Seid are relevant to remedy the shortcomings of Inoue and CN '755 with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, since claim 1 is not obvious over Inoue and CN '755, claim 1 is allowable over these references. Moreover, claims 3 and 7-9 depend from allowable claim 1, and are allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Inoue and/or CN '755 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0171383, applied for by Arai, *et al.* ("Arai"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over Inoue and/or CN '755, and Arai fails to cure the deficiencies of Inoue and/or CN '755 noted above with regard to claim 1. Hence, claim 9 is allowable at least because it depends from an allowable claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 1. Claims 3 and 7-9 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for this reason. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park  
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: July 5, 2007

**CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027**

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC  
8500 Leesburg Pike  
Suite 7500  
Vienna, VA 22182  
Tel: 703-288-5105  
Fax: 703-288-5139  
HCP/WMH/kbs